

DRAFT

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

I.D.#4844

ENERGY DIVISION

RESOLUTION E-3948

September 8, 2005

R E S O L U T I O N

Resolution E-3948. San Diego Gas and Electric for approval of its updated long-term procurement plan filed in compliance with D.04-12-048.

By Advice Letter 1684-E, filed April 12, 2005.

SUMMARY

This Resolution approves San Diego Gas and Electric Company's (SDG&E) updated long-term procurement plan filed in compliance with Decision (D.) 04-12-048.

Per Ordering Paragraph (OP) 1 of D.04-12-048, SDG&E filed its updated long-term procurement plan on April 12, 2005.¹

SDG&E requested that the filing be effective on March 25, 2005.

The Advice Letter (AL) submitted by SDG&E includes confidential appendices intended to demonstrate its compliance with D.04-12-048. SDG&E submitted those appendices as Confidential Material protected by Section 583 of the Public Utilities Code, which prohibits disclosure of confidential public utility information except by Commission order or in the course of a hearing or proceeding. SDG&E also provided public versions of its updated energy and capacity tables, which are based on aggregated data.

The City of Chula Vista protested SDG&E AL 1684 on May 2, 2005.

¹ SDG&E filed the update to its long-term procurement plan on March 25, 2005 as directed by D.04-12-048. In response to Energy Division's request, SDG&E resubmitted the filing as an Advice Letter on April 12, 2005.

This resolution rejects the City's protest and approves AL 1684-E effective today, August 25, 2005

BACKGROUND

D.04-12-048 orders the three major electric utilities to submit compliance filings to update their procurement plans in accordance with the direction provided in the Decision.

On December 16, 2004, the Commission adopted D.04-12-048 in Rulemaking (R.)04-04-003, an Order Instituting Rulemaking to Promote Policy and Program Coordination and Integration in Electric Utility Resource Planning.

The objective of D.04-12048 was "to give the three IOUs [investor-owned utilities] authorization to plan for and procure the resources necessary to provide reliable service to their customer loads for the planning period 2005 through 2014" as well as "coordinate and incorporate Commission and legislative efforts for other proceedings."² Towards this end, D.04-12-048 adopted the long term procurement plans of the three IOUs (Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and San Diego Gas and Electric Company), provided direction on resource planning, and ordered the following:

"Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), Southern California Edison Company (SCE), and San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) shall, by no later than March 25, 2005, submit a compliance filing updating their procurement plans to reflect the changes and modifications adopted in today's decision. This compliance filing, shall include, but not be limited to the following:

- a. Annual energy and capacity resource accounting tables, consistent with directions on baseline load forecasts adopted in this decision;
- b. Procurement activities undertaken by the utilities subsequent to their initial filings in this proceeding;
- c. Revised energy efficiency targets as adopted in Decision (D.) 04-09-060;
- d. Demand response programs proposed for 2005 implementation in Rulemaking (R.) 02-06-011;

² D.04-12-048, p.5

- e. The effect of resource adequacy and local reliability requirements adopted respectively in D.04-10-035 and D.04-07-028;
- f. Changes occurring as a result of Commission decisions implementing Community Choice Aggregation (CCA) in R.03-10-033;
- g. Revised forecasts for the price of natural gas, if necessary;
- h. Status of qualifying facilities (QFs) with soon to be expiring contracts; and
- i. Any other material information that affects the utilities' procurement activities."

In compliance with the Decision, PG&E, SCE and SDG&E submitted updates to their long-term procurement plans on March 25, 2005. In response to Energy Division's request, SDG&E resubmitted the filing as an Advice Letter on April 12, 2005.

NOTICE

Notice of AL 1684-E was made by publication in the Commission's Daily Calendar. SDG&E states that copies of the Advice Letter were mailed and distributed in accordance with Section III-G of General Order (GO) 96-A.

PROTESTS

The City of Chula Vista protested SDG&E AL 1684 on May 2, 2005. In its protest, the City of Chula Vista objects to "SDG&E's refusal to model and evaluate the development of CCA within its service territory for purposes of its LTRP"³ and points out to the direction provided in D.04-12-046 issued in R.03-10-003 (CCA proceeding):

"We share the parties' concerns that the utilities must recognize CCA load in their resource planning and should not sign contracts that might create new liabilities for CCA customers and utility customers where available information suggests the power might not be needed. We understand the utilities face a difficult balancing act by assuring adequate and reliable power supplies in amounts that reflect forecasts that are changing constantly. However, the utilities are accustomed to using available information to forecast customer

³ The Protest of the City of Chula Vista, p.1

demand and should incorporate CCA load losses into their planning efforts, just as they would include any other forecast variable related to expected changes in supply or demand.”⁴

The City is especially concerned that “if the implementation of CCA is not properly coordinated with the development in long term procurement plans, the utilities may over-procure and create new liability for CCA and utility customers.”⁵ Therefore, the City “urges the Commission to require it [SDG&E] to modify its plan to provide flexibility for implementation of CCA within its service territory at least to the level represented by a significant portion of its load within the City of Chula Vista.”⁶

In its response to the City’s protest, SDG&E states that: (1) the CCA Phase I decision does not require changes to SDG&E’s current resource plan, and (2) the City reargues its position that was already considered in R.04-04-003.

City of Chula Vista replied to SDG&E’s response on May 16, 2005. GO 96-A, as effective when SDG&E filed its advice letter, did not prohibit a response to SDG&E’s reply to the protest. We therefore allowed Chula Vista’s comments in response to SDG&E’s reply, but in the interest of fairness, allowed SDG&E to respond to those comments as well.

The City submits its reply “in order to clarify the statutory and regulatory underpinnings of the City’s position that SDG&E should be ordered to evaluate and account for the future development of CCA within its service territory.” The City states that: (1) SDG&E fails to comply with D.04-12-046 and D.04-12-048 by excluding CCA departing load estimates, (2) SDG&E is risking avoidable costs by not cooperating with the City, (3) per Assembly Bill (AB) 117 the utilities have a statutory obligation to cooperate with the potential CCAs.

On May 25, 2005, SDG&E responded to the City’s reply. SDG&E explains that the update does not require a revision regarding the CCA forecast at this time. SDG&E notes that “the only decision issued in that proceeding to date does not provide

⁴ D.04-12-046, p.30

⁵ The protest of the City, p.1

⁶ Ibid, p.3

sufficient detail for SDG&E to make adjustments to its resource plan for future implementation of CCA.”⁷

SDG&E adds that once the parameters are established, SDG&E will consider whether modifications to its resource plan are necessary. In response to the City’s concern on overprocurement, SDG&E notes that the utility is already fully resourced through 2009 due in large part to the DWR contracts and that the only activity that could be scaled back would be planned renewable acquisitions.

DISCUSSION

Energy Division reviewed SDG&E's compliance filing and concluded that SDG&E's updated long-term procurement plan complied with D.04-12-048.

Per the OP 1 of D.04-12-048, SDG&E filed its updated long-term procurement plan on April 12, 2005.⁸ SDG&E included the following information in its compliance filing:

- Annual energy and capacity resource accounting tables, with an updated load forecast to reflect 2004 actual data and the latest forecast input data;
- Revised energy efficiency targets based on D.04-09-060;
- Peak load reductions equal to 4% in 2006 and 5% in 2007-2016, consistent with the demand response targets set in D.03-06-032 and the demand response programs approved for 2005 in D.05-01-056;
- Updated natural gas price forecasts;
- Updated information on the amount, timing, and types of renewables added in the near-term based on the preliminary results of SDG&E’s current RFP;
- Current and expected renewal of QF contracts consistent with the 2004 LTPP;
- A reduction in SONG capacity to 14% beginning in 2009;
- Adjusted resource additions that reflect the change in overall need;

⁷ SDG&E’s Reply, p.1

- Preliminary results from its pending RFP.

Energy Division concludes that SDG&E's filing contains the updates ordered in D.04-12-048. Furthermore, consistent with the direction in D.04-12-048, we do not think that it is necessary for SDG&E to revise its energy and capacity need forecast at this time in order to include the CCA departing load estimates.

The OP 6 of the D.04-12-048 finds that "SDG&E's resource plan is reasonable, subject to the modifications required for the compliance filing described herein. SDG&E is essentially fully resourced through 2009, other than needed investments in renewable resources to meet RPS targets."

D.04-12-048 also states:

"We find that all three LTPPs are consistent with the 2003 IEPR, are reasonable for planning purposes and that the medium, preferred case should be followed for making planning and procurement decisions."⁹

Furthermore, D.04-12-048 finds:

"SDG&E's resource scenarios were the most complete and useful in understanding the impact of differing loads, risk strategies and the complex process of compiling a portfolio that meets reliability, adequacy, policy preferences and cost moderation goals. We find SDG&E's resource plan reasonable, subject to the modifications required for the compliance filing. SDG&E is essentially fully resourced through 2009, other than needed investments in renewable resources to meet RPS targets. Because SDG&E is fully resourced, SDG&E's resource plan is vulnerable to departing load and the utility is still obligated to meet its renewables, EE and DR goals. Since SDG&E's estimated reserve margins, which exceed 17% in some years during the planning period are the result of prior Commission decisions, there should be no finding of unreasonableness if they exceed 17%."¹⁰

⁹ D.04-12-048, p. 28.

¹⁰ D.04-12-048, pp.40-41.

SDG&E AL 1684-E/SKH

Based on the discussions and findings of D.04-12-048 listed above, we find that revising SDG&E's forecast will not have any impact on SDG&E's resource selection in the near term. Therefore, SDG&E does not need to revise its forecast at this time.

Even though D.04-12-046 states that: "...However, the utilities are accustomed to using available information to forecast customer demand and should incorporate CCA load losses into their planning efforts, just as they would include any other forecast variable related to expected changes in supply or demand.", D.04-12-048 does not order SDG&E to incorporate CCA departing load in its estimates at this time, but notes that:

"Future IOU procurement plans shall incorporate reasonable anticipated CCA departing load. A prospective CCA provider should inform the utility of its intentions as early in the planning cycle as possible. IOU plans shall acknowledge potential CCA departing load by identifying the CCA, estimated departing load, and the implication for utility procurement liabilities." (p.50)

Therefore, SDG&E should include the CCA departing load estimate in its next long-term procurement filing.

D.04-12-048 expressed the Commission's intent to provide updated capacity and energy tables, once the data are revised. Specifically, the Decision stated the following:

"This Commission favors openness in its decisions and in the information that market participants have in dealing with each other. Another section of this decision discusses specifically how we are responding to legislative direction on confidentiality matters. In this section we note that it is not the intent of the Commission to provide the means by which market power could be exercised against the LSEs and, hence, against electric service customers in California. Therefore, this decision does not present information about the current NOPs of the utilities. Nor do we provide the elements from which that information can be calculated. **However, we will provide simplified tables based on projections of future resource balance information for the years 2007-2014 after those numbers have been refreshed from their initial filing in July.**" (p.32) (emphasis added)

The AL submitted by SDG&E includes confidential appendices intended to demonstrate its compliance with D.04-12-048. SDG&E submitted those appendices as Confidential Material protected by Section 583 of the Public Utilities Code, which prohibits disclosure of confidential public utility information except by Commission order or in the course of a hearing or proceeding. SDG&E also provided public

DRAFT

Resolution E-3948

September 8, 2005

SDG&E AL 1684-E/SKH

versions of its updated energy and capacity tables, which are based on aggregated data.

The CPUC opened Rulemaking (R.)05-06-040, which will examine issues related to the disclosure of procurement-related data and documents, balancing the need for effective public participation with the potential harm to ratepayers that may result from disclosure of market sensitive data. In order not to prejudge the outcome of R.05-06-040, we will not disclose SDG&E's updated procurement data at this time. Depending on the outcome of R.05-06-040, we may require SDG&E to file a supplement to its advice letter.

COMMENTS

PU Code section 311(g) (1) provides that this resolution must be served on all parties and subject to at least 30 days public review and comment prior to a vote of the Commission. Section 311(g)(2) provides that this 30-day period may be reduced or waived upon the stipulation of all parties in the proceeding.

The 30-day comment period for the draft of this resolution was neither waived nor reduced. Accordingly this draft resolution is mailed to parties in R.04-04-003 and will be placed on the Commission's agenda no earlier than 30 days from today. Comments are due on August 22, 2005. Reply comments are due August 29, 2005.

FINDINGS

1. Per Ordering Paragraph (OP) 1 and 24 of D.04-12-048, SDG&E filed its updated long-term procurement plan.
2. Advice Letter 1684-E was protested by the City of Chula Vista.
3. Energy Division concludes that SDG&E's updated long-term procurement plans as filed in AL 1684 comply with D.04-12-048.
4. Based on the discussions and findings of D.04-12-048, we find that revising SDG&E's forecast will not have any impact on SDG&E's resource selection in the near term. Therefore, SDG&E does not need to revise its forecast at this time.
5. SDG&E should include the CCA departing load estimate in its next long-term procurement filing.
6. The AL submitted by SDG&E includes confidential appendices intended to demonstrate its compliance with D.04-12-048. SDG&E submitted those appendices as Confidential Material protected by Section 583 of the Public Utilities Code, which prohibits disclosure of confidential public utility information except by

DRAFT

Resolution E-3948
SDG&E AL 1684-E/SKH

September 8, 2005

Commission order or in the course of a hearing or proceeding. SDG&E also provided public versions of its updated energy and capacity tables, which are based on aggregated data.

7. The CPUC opened Rulemaking (R.)05-06-040, which will examine issues related to the disclosure of procurement-related data and documents, balancing the need for effective public participation with the potential harm to ratepayers that may result from disclosure of market sensitive data.
8. In order not to prejudge the outcome of R.05-06-040, we will not disclose SDG&E's updated procurement data at this time. Depending on the outcome of R.05-06-040, we may require SDG&E to disclose the updated procurement data submitted as part of its compliance filing Advice Letter 1684-E.

THEREFORE IT IS ORDERED THAT:

1. We approve SDG&E's Advice Letter 1684-E.
2. Depending on the outcome of R.05-06-040, we may require SDG&E to disclose the updated procurement data submitted as part of its compliance filing Advice Letter 1684-E.

This Resolution is effective today.

I certify that the foregoing resolution was duly introduced, passed and adopted at a conference of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California held on September 8, 2005; the following Commissioners voting favorably thereon:

STEVE LARSON
Executive Director

DRAFT

Resolution E-3948
SDG&E AL 1684-E/SKH
August 4, 2005

September 8, 2005

ID#4844 RESOLUTION E-3948
Commission Meeting September 8, 2005

TO: PARTIES TO San Diego Gas and Electric ADVICE LETTER NO 1684-E

Enclosed is draft Resolution Number E-3948 of the Energy Division. It will be on the agenda at the next Commission meeting, which is held at least 20 days after the date of this letter. The Commission may then vote on this Resolution or it may postpone a vote until later.

When the Commission votes on a draft Resolution, it may adopt all or part of it as written, amend, modify or set it aside and prepare a different Resolution. Only when the Commission acts does the Resolution become binding on the parties.

Parties may submit comments on the draft Resolution.

An original and two copies of the comments, with a certificate of service, should be submitted to:

Jerry Royer
Energy Division
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

A copy of the comments should be submitted to:

Sepideh Khosrowjah
Energy Division
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
Fax: 415-703-2200

DRAFT

Resolution E-3948
SDG&E AL 1684-E/SKH

September 8, 2005

Any comments on the draft Resolution must be received by the Energy Division by August 24, 2005. Those submitting comments must serve a copy of their comments on 1) the entire service list attached to the draft Resolution, 2) all Commissioners, and 3) the Director of the Energy Division, on the same date that the comments are submitted to the Energy Division.

Comments shall be limited to five pages in length plus a subject index listing the recommended changes to the draft Resolution, a table of authorities and an appendix setting forth the proposed findings and ordering paragraphs.

Comments shall focus on factual, legal or technical errors in the proposed draft Resolution. Comments that merely reargue positions taken in the advice letter or protests will be accorded no weight and are not to be submitted.

Replies to comments on the draft resolution may be filed (i.e., received by the Energy Division) on August 31, 2005, five days after comments are filed, and shall be limited to identifying misrepresentations of law or fact contained in the comments of other parties. Replies shall not exceed five pages in length, and shall be filed and served as set forth above for comments.

Late submitted comments or replies will not be considered.

Judith Ikle
Energy Division

Enclosure: Service List
Certificate of Service

DRAFT

Resolution E-3948
SDG&E AL 1684-E/SKH

September 8, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I have by mail this day served a true copy of Draft Resolution E-3948 on all parties in these filings or their attorneys as shown on the attached list.

Dated August 4, 2005 at San Francisco, California.

Jerry Royer

NOTICE

Parties should notify the Energy Division, Public Utilities
Commission, 505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 4002
San Francisco, CA 94102, of any change of address to
insure that they continue to receive documents. You
must indicate the Resolution number on the service list
on which your name appears.

Service List for E-3948

abb@eslawfirm.com
aclark@calpine.com
ajo@cpuc.ca.gov
alan.comnes@dynegy.com
amabed@semprautilities.com
andrew@simpsonpartners.com
annette.gilliam@sce.com
aorchar@smud.org
armi@smwlaw.com
aweller@sel.com
ayk@cpuc.ca.gov
bbarkovich@earthlink.net
bcragg@gmssr.com
bcragg@gmssr.com
bds@cpuc.ca.gov
berj.parseghian@sce.com
beth.fox@sce.com
bfranklin@eob.ca.gov
bill.chen@constellation.com
bill@jbsenergy.com.
bjones@mjbbradley.com
blaising@braunlegal.com
bmcc@mccarthyllaw.com
bpowers@powersengineering.com
brflynn@flynnrci.com
brian.theaker@williams.com
bsk@cpuc.ca.gov
cab@cpuc.ca.gov
cabaker906@sbcglobal.net
car@cpuc.ca.gov
carlo.zorzoli@enel.it
case.admin@sce.com
cem@newsdata.com
centralfiles@semprautilities.com
ceyap@earthlink.net
chris@emeter.com
chrishilen@dwt.com
chrism@mid.org
ckmitchell1@sbcglobal.net
cleni@energy.state.ca.us
clyde.murley@comcast.net
cmkehrrein@ems-ca.com
cmlong@earthlink.net
cpe@cpuc.ca.gov
cpuccases@pge.com
cpucservice@manatt.com
craigtyler@comcast.net
ctoca@utility-savings.com
curtis.kebler@gs.com
daking@sempra.com
dbachrach@nrdc.org

ddowers@sflower.org
dgarber@sempra.com
dgeis@dolphingroup.org
dhuard@manatt.com
diane_fellman@fpl.com
dickerson05@fscgroup.com
djh@cpuc.ca.gov
dkates@sonic.net
dkk@eslawfirm.com
dks@cpuc.ca.gov
dmahmud@mwdh2o.com
dmarcus2@sbcglobal.net
don.winslow@ppmenergy.com
douglass@energyattorney.com
dpa@cpuc.ca.gov
dsandino@water.ca.gov
dsaul@solel.com
dsh@cpuc.ca.gov
dwood8@cox.net
dws@r-c-s-inc.com
edchang@flynnrci.com
edwardoneill@dwt.com
ehull@ci.chula-vista.ca.us
eleuze@caiso.com
ell5@pge.com
elvine@lbl.gov
e-recipient@caiso.com
eric@strategyi.com
evk1@pge.com
eyussman@knowledgeinenergy.com
fdeleon@energy.state.ca.us
filings@a-klaw.com
fortlieb@sandiego.gov
frank.cooley@sce.com
freedman@turn.org
garson_knapp@fpl.com
gbaker@sempra.com
gbrowne@smud.org
ghinners@reliant.com
gig@cpuc.ca.gov
glw@eslawfirm.com
gmorris@emf.net
greg.blue@dynegy.com
grosenblum@caiso.com
gtholan@caiso.com
gumbrelli@cs.com
gxl2@pge.com
hchoy@isd.co.la.ca.us
info@tobiaslo.com
irene.stillings@sdenenergy.org
j0b5@pge.com

September 8, 2005

Resolution E-3948**SDG&E AL 1684-E/SKH**

jackp@calpine.com
james.booth@hklaw.com
jarmstrong@gmssr.com
jasmin.e.milles@verizon.com
jay.bhalla@intergycorp.com
jbradley@svmg.org
jcervantes@sandiego.gov
jeanne.sole@sfgov.org
jef@cpuc.ca.gov
jeffgray@dwt.com
jennifer.holmes@itron.com
jesus.arredondo@nrgenergy.com
jf2@cpuc.ca.gov
jgalloway@ucsusa.org
jimross@r-c-s-inc.com
jkarp@whitecase.com
jkloberdanz@semprautilities.com
jleslie@luce.com
jlmk@pge.com
JMcMahon@navigantconsulting.com
joe.como@sfgov.org
johnrredding@earthlink.net
joyw@mid.org
jpacheco@water.ca.gov
jparrott@sempra.com
jskillman@prodigy.net
jsqueri@gmssr.com
jtachera@energy.state.ca.us
jweil@aglet.org
karen@klindh.com
kcordova@semprautilities.com
kdg@cpuc.ca.gov
kduggan@capstoneturbine.com
kdw@woodruff-expert-services.com
keith.fuller@itron.com
keith.mccrea@sablav.com
keithwhite@earthlink.net
kena@calpine.com
kglick@eob.ca.gov
kgriffin@energy.state.ca.us
kjk@kjkammerer.com
kl1@cpuc.ca.gov
klatt@energyattorney.com
kmcspadden@milbank.com
kmelville@sempra.com
kmills@cbbf.com
kmorton@sempra.com
kms@cpuc.ca.gov
knotsund@uclink.berkeley.edu
kpp@cpuc.ca.gov
l_brown123@sbcglobal.net
LAdocket@cpuc.ca.gov
laura.genao@sce.com
laura.larks@sce.com
lcasentini@drintl.com

lcottle@whitecase.com
liddell@energyattorney.com
linda.sherif@calpine.com
lisa.decker@constellation.com
lisaweinzimer@sbcglobal.net
ljr@cpuc.ca.gov
lkaye@ka-pow.com
lmh@eslawfirm.com
lp1@cpuc.ca.gov
lrm@cpuc.ca.gov
lscott@landsenergy.com
lurick@sempra.com
magq@pge.com
marks@alohasys.com
mary.lynch@constellation.com
matt@bradylawus.com
mclaughlin@braunlegal.com
mcmannes@aol.com
mdbk@pge.com
mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com
meb@cpuc.ca.gov
mecsoft@pacbell.net
meg@cpuc.ca.gov
mflorio@turn.org
michael.backstrom@sce.com
michael.crumley@elpaso.com
michaelboyd@sbcglobal.net
mjaske@energy.state.ca.us
mjskowronski@inlandenergy.com
mlennon@whitecase.com
mlgillette@duke-energy.com
Mmesseng@energy.state.ca.us
mona.tierney@constellation.com
moxsen@calpine.com
mpa@a-klaw.com
mrh2@pge.com
mrw@mrwassoc.com
mschmidt@semprautilities.com
mshames@ucan.org
msnow@manatt.com
msw@cpuc.ca.gov
mtrexler@climateservices.com
mts@cpuc.ca.gov
mzr@cpuc.ca.gov
nao@cpuc.ca.gov
nes@a-klaw.com
nil@cpuc.ca.gov
npedersen@hanmor.com
nrader@calwea.org
ntoyama@smud.org
pcmcdonnell@earthlink.net
pduvair@energy.state.ca.us
peterbray@yahoo.com
pha@cpuc.ca.gov
philm@scdenergy.com

September 8, 2005

Resolution E-3948

SDG&E AL 1684-E/SKH

ppettingill@caiso.com
psd@cpuc.ca.gov
puma@davis.com
rae@cpuc.ca.gov
ramonag@ebmud.com
rberliner@manatt.com
rejohnson@att.com
rhoftman@anaheim.net
rhwisner@lbl.gov
rick_noger@praxair.com
rliebert@cfbf.com
rmd@cpuc.ca.gov
rmiller@energy.state.ca.us
roger.pelote@williams.com
rru@sandag.org
rsa@a-klaw.com
rschmidt@bartlewells.com
rsparks@caiso.com
rwalther@pacbell.net
rwethera@energy.state.ca.us
samuel.r.sadler@state.or.us
sarveybob@aol.com
sberlin@mccarthy-law.com
scarter@nrdc.org
scasey@swater.org
scott.anders@sdenergy.org
sed@cpuc.ca.gov
service@spurr.org
sia2@pwrval.com
sjl@cpuc.ca.gov
sscb@pge.com

sschleimer@calpine.com
ssmyers@att.net
sst@cpuc.ca.gov
stevegreenwald@dwt.com
steven@iepa.com
susan.freedman@sdenergy.org
tam@cpuc.ca.gov
tcarlson@reliant.com
tcarr@sempra.com
tcx@cpuc.ca.gov
tdp@cpuc.ca.gov
ted@energy-solution.com
tglaviano@energy.state.ca.us
tim.hemig@nrgenergy.com
tomb@crossborderenergy.com
toms@i-cpg.com
trf@cpuc.ca.gov
troberts@sempra.com
vhconsult@earthlink.net
vjb@cpuc.ca.gov
vjw3@pge.com
vwood@smud.org
wbooth@booth-law.com
william.tomlinson@elpaso.com
wkeilani@semprautilities.com
woodruijb@sce.com
wsm@cpuc.ca.gov
wwwesterfield@stoel.com
ygross@sempra.com
ztc@cpuc.ca.gov